



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,067	12/28/2001	John Durbin Husher	2208P	9458
29141	7590	05/19/2004	EXAMINER	
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP P O BOX 51418 PALO ALTO, CA 94303				WILSON, CHRISTIAN D
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2824		

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	HUSHER, JOHN DURBIN	
Examiner	Art Unit 2824	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2004.
2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 9-22 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 9-22 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains legal language such as comprises. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 9 – 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellul *et al.* in view of Thomas *et al.*

Regarding claim 9, Ellul *et al.* (US 5,614,750) teaches a semiconductor device [Figure 6] comprising a substrate **52**, a plurality of device structures **90**, a buried layer **54**, an interconnect comprising a slot **78**, a conductive material **82** in the slot, oxidized sidewalls **80** which forms a sinker to the buried layer [column 4, lines 63-67]. Thomas *et al.* (US 4,933,743) teaches a metal **26** in a slot to form an interconnect. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a metal in the device of Ellul *et al.* since Ellul *et al.* teaches the use of other conductive materials such as those taught by Thomas *et al.*

Regarding claims 10 – 12, Thomas *et al.* further teaches multiple metals in the interconnect slot which partially fill the slot with a final metal which provides the interconnect

layer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the multiple metals of Thomas *et al.* in the device Ellul *et al.* since the structure of Thomas *et al.* provides lower resistance and improved electromigration resistance [column 2, lines 63-67].

Regarding claim 17, Ellul *et al.* further teaches a sinker coupled to a collector **55**.

4. Claims 13 – 16 and 18 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellul *et al.* in view of Thomas *et al.*

Regarding claim 13, Ellul *et al.* teaches a semiconductor device [Figure 6] comprising a buried layer **54**, an interconnect comprising a slot **78**, a conductive material **82** in the slot, oxidized sidewalls **80** which forms a sinker to the buried layer [column 4, lines 63-67]. Thomas *et al.* teaches a metal **26** in a slot to form an interconnect. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a metal in the device of Ellul *et al.* since Ellul *et al.* teaches the use of other conductive materials such as those taught by Thomas *et al.*

Regarding claims 14 – 16, 20, and 22, Thomas *et al.* further teaches multiple metals in the interconnect slot which partially fill the slot with a final metal which provides the interconnect layer where the high current carrying conductors are on the same level [Figure 1L]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the multiple metals of Thomas *et al.* in the device Ellul *et al.* since the structure of Thomas *et al.* provides lower resistance and improved electromigration resistance [column 2, lines 63-67].

Regarding claim 18, Ellul *et al.* further teaches a slot coupled to the emitter **94**.

Regarding claims 19 and 21, Ellul *et al.* further teaches a CMOS integrated circuit structure with a bipolar device. Thomas *et al.* teaches an integrated circuit with bipolar and MOS logic circuits on the same device [column 1, lines 12-25]. It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art to use the device of Ellul *et al.* in an IC comprising bipolar transistors and MOS transistors since these are well known in the art as devices integrated on the same circuit using high voltage interconnects.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed October 14, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Applicant argues that neither Ellul *et al.* nor Thomas *et al.* teach the limitations of the claimed invention, but no arguments are made against the combination of Ellul *et al.* and Thomas *et al.* as used in the preceding rejection. Arguments should be directed to the combination of Ellul *et al.* and Thomas *et al.* and the motivation to combine them.

Further, applicant alleges that Thomas only teaches the use of an interconnect system on top of the substrate. Thomas *et al.* teaches a metal 26 in a slot to form an interconnect. This teaching is used in combination with Ellul *et al.* to meet the limitations of claims 9 – 22 as described above.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christian Wilson whose telephone number is (571) 272-1886. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays, 7:30 AM to 4 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Elms can be reached on (571) 272-1869. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2800.

Christian Wilson, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2824

CDW
May 13, 2004



ANH PHUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER